

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8
9 YVONNE ROUNDTREE,
10 Plaintiff,

11
12 v.

13 MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a
14 Washington corporation,
15 Defendant.
16

Case No. C15-0760 RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REOPEN

17
18 Plaintiff initially brought a Complaint against Microsoft, seeking millions of dollars in
19 damages on the basis that it had apparently refused to remove her photos and information about
20 prior arrests and jail time locate on the internet. On May 14, 2015, Defendant removed the
21 instant matter from King County Superior Court to this Court. Dkt. #1. In so doing, Defendant
22 noted that it had not yet been properly served, but that it had been made aware of the lawsuit
23 when members of the Board of Directors received copies of the documents in the mail. *Id.* On
24 June 8, 2015, Plaintiff filed a “Notice Contesting Validity of Removal” in which she stated that
25 she was moving for reinstatement of her case to the Superior Court. Dkt. #4. The Court
26 construed the Notice as a Motion to Remand, and directed Defendant to respond. Defendant
27 filed its opposition to the motion and Plaintiff replied. Dkts. #6 and #7. The Court
28
29
30

1 ultimately denied the motion. Dkt. #8. Defendant then moved to dismiss the case, which the
2 Court granted on October 9, 2015. Dkts. #9 and #11. The dismissal was with prejudice, and
3 the matter was closed.
4

5 Plaintiff has now moved to reopen her case, apparently to add as new Defendants
6 “Bing, Yahoo and Google, etc.,” for their failure to remove her photos and prior arrest
7 information from the internet, despite her multiple requests to do so. Dkt. #12.
8

9 This case was previously dismissed with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil
10 Procedure 12(b)(5) for insufficiency of service of process and under Federal Rule of Civil
11 Procedure 12(b)(2) for lack of personal jurisdiction. Dkt. #11. Nothing in Plaintiff’s
12 instant motion persuades the Court that it should reopen the matter to add new Defendants,
13 nor does Plaintiff provide any legal authority requiring that the Court do so.
14

15 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen (Dkt.
16 #12) is DENIED.
17

18 DATED this 14th day of April, 2017.
19

20 

21 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
22 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30